

Message Text

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04157 01 OF 05 181241 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W
----- 100174

P R 181124 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8903

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 464

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 5 VIENNA 4157

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

EO 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM

SUBJECT: MBFR: AD HOC GROUP MEETING MAY 17

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) REPORTED ON CONVERSATION HE AND US REP HAD WITH KHLESTOV (SOV REP) (VIENNA 4101) IN WHICH LATTER RAISED MATTER OF DISCUSSING AGENDA IN PLENARIES AND SMALLER GROUPS. THIS PROMPTED CONTINUATION OF DISCUSSION, BEGUN IN AD HOC GROUP ON MAY 15, CONCERNING DESIRABLE SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF WETERN PARTICIPANTS IN A SMALLER GROUP WHICH WOULD DISCUSS THE AGENDA AFTER FORMAL AGENDA PRESENTATION IN MAY 17 PLENARY. UK REP SAW EVIDENCE OF SOVIET DELAYING TACTICS
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04157 01 OF 05 181241 Z

IN KHLESTOV'S DESIRE TO POSTPONE FIRST MEETING OF AGENDA GROUP UNTIL MAY 21 AND PROPOSED THAT ALLIES MAKE CLEAR TO THE EAST THAT SUCH TACTICS WOULD NOT WORK. TURKISH REP (TULUMEN) READ INSTRUCTIONS FROM HIS AUTHORITIES WHICH ALLOWED HIM TO GO ALONG

WITH A GROUP CONSENSUS ON THE FORMATION OF A SMALLER GROUP, PROVIDED THAT IT BE BASED ON AN ENLARGED EMISSARY SYSTEM WITHOUT DISTINCTION BETWEEN DIRECT AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS AND THAT AGENDA DISCUSSION BY A GROUP BE CONDUCTED ONLY AT INFORMAL GATHERINGS. ITALIAN REP (PETRIGNANI) ALSO REPORTED THAT HIS AUTHORITIES, WHILE PREFERRING EITHER A SLIGHTLY AUGMENTED EMISSARY SYSTEM OR AN ALL 19 APPROACH, COULD ACCEPT A SMALLER GROUP PROVIDING THAT IT WAS INFORMAL, UNOFFICIAL AND FLEXIBLE IN THE SENSE THAT ITS COMPOSITION COULD VARY AS NEEDED AND WITHOUT REQUIRING AGREEMENT BY THE SOVIETS. GROUP DEFERRED MAKING A FINAL DECISION PENDING FURTHER DISCUSSION WITH SOVIETS, BUT DID AGREE TO SEEK AT LEAST ONE PLENARY MEETING DURING WEEK OF MAY 21-25. END SUMMARY.

2. BILATERALS:

(A) FRG REP (RUTH) SAID HE HAD TWO BILATERALS TO REPORT TO THE GROUP. THE FIRST WAS WITH KHESTOV IMMEDIATELY AFTER MAY 16 PLENARY. FRG REP ASKED KHESTOV WHY IN HIS OPENING STATEMENT LATTER HAD USED RUSSIAN ALPHABETICAL ORDER, LISTING FRG AT THE END OF COUNTRIES PARTICIPATING. KHESTOV SAID THAT THE STATEMENT WAS OF A UNILATERAL NATURE AND THE SEQUENCE WAS THEREFORE AT HIS OPTION. THE LISTING OF THE FRG USED WAS THE NORMAL PRACTICE IN RUSSIAN. KHESTOV ADDED, HOWEVER, THAT HE RECOGNIZED THAT THE ARRANGEMENTS AGREED UPON IN THE PROCEDURES PAPER FOR LISTING OF THE FRG WERE BINDING. HE HAD MADE AN EXCEPTION IN HIS PLENARY STATEMENT ONLY BECAUSE IT WAS OF A UNILATERAL NATURE. KHESTOV COMPLAINED ABOUT THE WESTERN PRESS CONFERENCE OF MAY 14, SAYING THAT NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) HAD MISREPRESENTED THE HUNGARIAN QUESTION AND MEMBERS OF THE EASTERN PRESS HAD NOT BEEN INVITED TO THE CONFERENCE. IN A SECOND BILATERAL WITH STRULAK (POLISH REP), LATTER SAID THAT POLISH PLENARY STATEMENT ON MAY 17 WOULD CONTAIN ONE SHORT AGENDA POINT AND WOULD REQUEST THAT AGREEMENT BE REACHED ON IT. STRULAK ADDED THAT THE ONE AGENDA POINT WOULD REFER TO THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL SECURITY. HE MADE CLEAR THAT THE EAST WOULD BE WILLING TO DISCUSS THIS ONE AGENDA POINT FOR A VERY LONG TIME.

SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04157 01 OF 05 181241 Z

(B) BELGIAN REP (ADRIAENSSEN) REPORTED THAT GDR REP (BRIE) SHARED HIS VIEW THAT LIMITING COMPOSITION OF WORKING GROUP TO DISCUSS AGENDA TO ONLY FOUR ON EACH SIDE WAS UNDESIRABLE BECAUSE FLANKS COULD BE EXCLUDED. GDR REP ALSO SAID THAT KHESTOV FAVORED A UN- STYLE COMMITTEE ON THE AGENDA IN WHICH DIRECT PARTICIPANTS WOULD ACTUALLY WORK OUT THE AGENDA WHILE OTHER WOULD HAVE AN UNLIMITED RIGHT TO BE PRESENT. BELGIAN REP TOLD GROUP THAT HE HAD NOT HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO DISCUSS THIS MATTER WITH KHESTOV YET, BUT WANTED TO REPORT TO THE GROUP FIRST. FRG REP COMMENTED THAT STRULAK HAD ALSO REFERRED TO AN OPEN- ENDED GROUP TO DISCUSS AGENDA.

(C) NETHERLANDS REP (QUARLES) REPORTED ON CONVERSATIONS HE AND

US REP HAD HAD WITH KHLESTOV ON MAY 16 (SEE VIENNA 4101).

(1) KHLESTOV HAD ASKED THAT PLENARY FOR FIRST PRESENTATION OF AGENDA QUESTIONS BE POSTPONED FROM 1030 HOURS TO 1500 HOURS ON MAY 17. KHLESTOV SAID THAT ALL PARTICIPANTS SHOULD HAVE THE RIGHT TO SPEAK AT THE PLENARY ON AGENDA ITEMS. THE MAIN SPEAKER ON THE EASTERN SIDE WOULD BE THE POLISH REP, BUT GDR REP WOULD ALSO MAKE A STATEMENT AND ROMANIANS WOULD PRESENT THEIR NATIONAL VIEWS. KHLESTOV HAD STATED THAT HE HAD BEEN HAVING DIFFICULTIES WITH ROMANIANS AND WAS LOOKING FOR A WAY TO GIVE THEM A RIGHT TO EXPRESS THEIR VIEWS. HE WANTED AN AGREEMENT TO ESTABLISH WORKING GROUPS AND TO HAVE PERIODIC PLENARIES TO EXPRESS IDEAS AMONG ALL 19. US AND NETHERLANDS REPS REQUESTED THAT WRITTEN TEXTS OF STATEMENTS ON AGENDA BE CIRCULATED AND PROPOSED THAT ONE PLENARY BE HELD PER WEEK. KHLESTOV DOUBTED WHETHER A GROUP OF 10 PARTICIPANTS COULD PROCEED IN A BUSINESS-LIKE WAY TO DISCUSS AGENDA, BUT AGREED TO HAVING A WEEKLY PLENARY. WESTERN REPS SAID THEY WOULD REFER THE MATTER TO THEIR COLLEAGUES BUT FELT THAT PROCEEDING WITH NUMEROUS PLENARIES WOULD NOT CONTRIBUTE TO COMPLETING THE WORK AHEAD AND COULD PROLONG MATTERS. KHLESTOV THEN SUGGESTED FOLLOWING UN PRACTICE BY ESTABLISHING AN UNOFFICIAL GROUP, BUT DID NOT GO INTO ITS COMPOSITION.

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04157 02 OF 05 181336 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 100647

P R 181124 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8904

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 465

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 5 VIENNA 4157

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

(2) KHLESTOV HAD ASKED IF WEST COULD AGREE TO HAVE A SECOND PLENARY ON AGENDA BY MAY 25 AND THEN MEET A WEEK LATER. WHATEVER THE WESTERN VIEW, HE ADDED, THE MEETINGS ON AGENDA SHOULD BE IN THE IAEA BUILDING WITH TRANSLATORS AVAILABLE. WESTERN REPS REPLIED THAT KHLESTOV'S PROPOSAL TO USE PLENARIES FOR AGENDA DISCUSSION WOULD NEEDLESSLY FORMALIZE THE SITUATION AND MAKE DISCUSSION CUMBERSOME, BUT THEY AGREED TO REFER THE MATTER TO THEIR COLLEAGUES. KHLESTOV SUPPOSED THAT TRANSLATION SUPPORT COULD BE LIMITED TO RUSSIAN, BUT SUGGESTED THAT THE FIRST INFORMAL DISCUSSION OF AGENDA TAKE PLACE ON THE AFTERNOON OF MAY 21. WESTERN REPS OBJECTED TO THE TIME SLIPPAGE AND KHLESTOV REPLIED THAT HE HAD SERIOUS REASONS FOR POSTPONING. (LATER TIMERBAYEV TOLD QUARLES THAT THE REASON FOR THE DELAY WAS TO SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04157 02 OF 05 181336 Z

ALLOW THE EAST TO STUDY THE WESTERN STATEMENT ON AGENDA.) KHLESTOV SAID HE COULD MEET EVERYDAY AFTER THE 21 ST. NETHERLANDS REP THEN TOLD GROUP THAT WESTERN REPS HAD AGREED, SUBJECT TO GROUP APPROVAL, TO HOLDING THE NEXT PLENARY ON MAY 25 AND HAD AGREED IN PRINCIPLE THAT WORK IN SOME MORE RESTRICTED CIRCLE SHOULD BE COMPLEMENTED WITH PLENARY SESSIONS. US REP ADDED THAT HE AND NETHERLANDS REP HAD REPLIED NEGATIVELY TO KHLESTOV'S SUGGESTION THAT THE SMALL GROUP SHOULD REPORT TO THE PARTICIPANTS IN PLENARY SESSION AND MADE THE POINT THAT NO OFFICIAL COGNIZANCE SHOULD BE GIVEN TO THE SMALLER GROUP. KHLESTOV HAD AGREED.

(D) CANADIAN REP (GRANDE) REPORTED THAT HE HAD CONFERRED WITH GDR AND POLISH REPS ABOUT ORDER OF SPEAKERS FOR MAY 17 PLENARY. IT WAS AGREED THAT POLISH STATEMENT WOULD BE MADE FIRST FOLLOWED BY CANADIAN, GDR, AND ROMANIAN REPS. TEXTS OF THE POLISH AND GDR STATEMENTS WOULD BE CIRCULATED BUT THOSE PROVIDED TO INTERPRETERS WOULD BE WITHDRAWN AFTERWARDS. POLISH AND GDR REPS COULD NOT SAY WHETHER TEXT OF ROMANIAN STATEMENT WOULD BE CIRCULATED.

3. TEMPO OF DISCUSSION ON AGENDA: UK REP (THOMSON) SAID THAT IT WAS HARD TO TELL WHAT SOVIET INTENTIONS ON TIMING WERE AND THAT HE HAD APPREHENSIONS ABOUT THE REASONS FOR THE SOVIET REQUEST TO DELAY AGENDA DISCUSSIONS UNTIL MAY 21. IT WAS POSSIBLE THAT THE SOVIETS WERE AIMING TO PUT A TIME SQUEEZE ON THE WEST BY SAYING THAT NOTHING ELSE WILL BE AGREED UNTIL THE WEST AGREED TO EASTERN AGENDA PROPOSALS. TWO THINGS COULD BE DONE TO COMBAT THIS POSSIBLE TACTIC, ONE NOW, THE OTHER LATER. FIRST THE ALLIES SHOULD REITERATE THE NATO POSITION ON THE PACKAGE APPROACH TO THE REMAINING ITEMS REQUIRING AGREEMENT, AND BE PREPARED TO FALL BACK FROM PARA C(1) TO PARA C(2) IN THE NAC GUIDANCE. THE ALLIES SHOULD ALSO REITERATE THAT THEY EXPECT EXPEDITIOUS TREATMENT OF THESE REMAINING ITEMS AND PUT THE SOVIETS ON NOTICE THAT THIS IS THE WESTERN POSITION. SECOND IT IS CLEAR THAT THE

S

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04157 03 OF 05 181347 Z

47

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 100724

P R 181124 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8905

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 466

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 3 OF 5 VIENNA 4157

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

7. SIZE AND COMPOSITION OF DISCUSSION GROUP ON AGENDA: FRG REP DISPUTED BELGIAN REP' S REMARKS AND SAID THAT NAC INSTRUCTIONS DID NOT REFER TO PLENARIES. ALLIED NEGOTIATORS WERE INSTRUCTED TO OBTAIN EASTERN VIEWS ON AGENDA, AND IT WAS LEFT UP TO THE GROUP TO DETERMINE WHO THE ALLIED NEGOTIATORS WOULD BE AND HOW THEY WOULD PROCEED. FRG REP ADDED THAT HE HAD DIFFICULTY ENVISIONING A PLENARY DISCUSSION OF AGENDA DETAILS TO FORMULATE PRECISE DECISIONS AND DRAFT AGREED DOCUMENTS. BELGIAN REP QUALIFIED HIS REMARKS SAYING THAT HIS MAIN POINT WAS THAT THE WORKING GROUP SHOULDNOTBE ALLOWED TO BECOME AN ENGINE DRIVING THE DISCUSSIONS AND CREATING TIME PRESSURE. RATHER, THE OPPOSITE SHOULD OCCUR WITH WORK IN THE PLENARIES BEING USED TO SPEED UP THE PACE OF WORKING GROUPS.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04157 03 OF 05 181347 Z

8. ITALIAN REP (PETRIGNANI) NOTED SOVIET HINTS REVEALED TO US AND NETHERLANDS REPS THAT PLENARIES WERE NOW THE KEY ELEMENT. BOTH SIDES HAD ARRIVED AT A DELICATELY BALANCED SOLUTION TO THE PARTICIPATION PROBLEM WHICH COULD ONLY BE MAINTAINED BY

CONTINUING PLENARY MEETINGS. TO ONLY START AND END WITH PLENARY MEETINGS WOULD EMPTY THAT SOLUTION OF ALL ITS MEANING AND COULD HAVE ADVERSE EFFECTS ON PUBLIC OPINION. THE TALKS ARE DEFINED AS HAVING 19 PARTICIPANTS AND THEREFORE 19 MUST PARTICIPATE. THIS CAN ONLY BE ASSURED THROUGH PLENARY MEETINGS. A CHANNEL HAS NOW BEEN CREATED AND IT IS IMPORTANT TO PRESERVE IT. FRG REP COMMENTED THAT THERE WOULD BE A COMBINATION OF FORUMS AND NOTED THAT ITALIAN REP DID NOT EXCLUDE THE ESTABLISHMENT OF MORE EFFICIENT FORUMS.

9. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT DISCUSSION RISKED LOSING ITS SENSE OF PROPORTION. WHILE THE HOLDING OF PLENARIES WAS IMPORTANT FOR PUBLIC OPINION, LIMITED PRACTICAL CONTACTS TO ELICIT THE VIEWS OF THE OTHER SIDE SHOULD NOT BE RULED OUT. HE COULD NOT SEE HOW THE WORKING GROUP COULD BECOME A MOTOR FOR THE TALKS IN THE SHORT PERIOD IN QUESTION, I. E., ONE WEEK, AND WOULD PLEAD THAT THE GROUP AVOID TAKING A LONG- TERM VIEW OF A LIMITED PRACTICAL PROBLEM WHEN IT WAS ESSENTIAL THAT WORK BE CONDUCTED IN A SMALLER MORE EFFICIENT GROUP.

10. NORWEGIAN DEP REP (WIKBERG) SAID THAT SOVIETS APPEARED TO BE TRYING TO FORMALIZE THE WORKING GROUP CONCEPT AND THAT HE SUPPORTED BELGIUM AND ITALY' S OPPOSITION TO THAT TACTIC. THE ARRANGEMENTS REGARDING PROCEDURES AND PARTICIPATION MUST BE MAINTAINED. SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS HAD THE RIGHT TO BE PRESENT AND STATE THEIR VIEWS. WHETHER THE GROUP PLACES EMPHASIS ON PLENARIES OR NOT DEPENDS ON THE ORGANIZATION OF THE WORKING GROUPS. TURKISH REP COMMENTED THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT THAT THE SIZE OF THE WORKING GROUP BE KEPT SMALL AND NOT INCLUDE ALL DIRECT PARTICIPANTS.

11. FRG REP SUGGESTED THAT PLENARIES COULD BE HELD ONCE A WEEK TO PERMIT RAISING OF MATTERS OF SPECIAL INTEREST TO PARTICULAR PARTICIPANTS. THE AD HOC GROUP COULD THEN DEVELOP THESE MATTERS IN SUBSEQUENT DISCUSSIONS. THE WEST DID NOT YET HAVE MUCH EXPERIENCE IN DISCUSSING SUBSTANCE IN PLENARIES AND THIS EXPERIENCE COULD NOT BE DEVELOPED NOW. WEEKLY PLENARIES COULD
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04157 03 OF 05 181347 Z

SAFEGUARD THE INTEREST OF THOSE DESIRING TO SPEAK AND WOULD PROVIDE AN OPPRTUNITY TO PRESENT VIEWS FOR PUBLIC OPINION PURPOSES TO THE OTHER SIDE. ONCE AGREEMENT WAS REACHED TO HAVE ONE PLENARY PER WEEK, THE PARTICIPANTS COULD RETURN TO SOME OTHER FORUM. CANADIAN REP POINTED OUT PLENARIES COULD NOT BE HELD UNLESS THERE WAS ACTUALLY SOMETHING TO SAY. HE THEREFORE PROPOSED A COMBINATION OF BOTH FORMAL PLENARIES FOR ALL 19 AND INFORMAL MEETINGS OF A SMALLER GROUP. GROUP THEN AGREED THAT ONE PLENARY WOULD BE HELD DURING THE WEEK OF MAY 21-25.

12. DISCUSSION OF ITALIAN AND TURKISH POSITIONS ON AGENDA FORUM: TURKISH REP SAID THAT HIS GOVERNMENT COULD APPROVE THE COURSE OF ACTION UNDER CONSIDERATION IN THE GROUP. TURKEY FELT IT WAS IM-

PORTANT, HOWEVER, THAT AGREEMENT BE REACHED TO NOT RESTRICT
PARTICIPATION TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS, AND THAT THE RIGHTS OF
SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS BE RECOGNIZED, ESPECIALLY IN THE PLENARY
M

SECRET

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04157 04 OF 05 181431 Z

42

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAJ-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 101133

P R 181124 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8906

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 467

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 4 OF 5 VIENNA 4157

13. ITALIAN REP SAID THAT IN REACHING THEIR DECISION HIS
AUTHORITIES TOOK THREE POINTS INTO CONSIDERATION: THE PROSPECT
OF EXPANSION OF THE PRESENT EMISSARY TO SEVEN WESTERN PAR-
TICIPANTS, THE OPTION AVAILABLE TO ANYONE OF THE SEVEN TO NOT
BE PRESENT, AND THAT INCLUSION OF WESTERN SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS
CAN BE BEST DECIDED BY THE AD HOC GROUP. HE SAID THERE WAS A
STRONG PREFERENCE OF THE ITALIAN GOVT TO CONTINUE WITH THE
QUARLES- DEAN CHANNEL, POSSIBLY SOMEWHAT AUGMENTED, OR TO ATTEMPT
TO REACH AGREEMENT ON THE COMMUNIQUE AND THE AGENDA THROUGH IN-
FORMAL MEETINGS OF ALL 19. THE FACTORS DESCRIBED BY THE TURKISH
REP COINCIDES WITH THE VIEW OF HIS AUTHORITIES, ITALIAN REP SAID.
HOWEVER HIS GOVT COULD ACCEPT AN OUTCOME WHEREBY THE COMPOSITION
OF A SMALLER GROUP FOR THE DISCUSSION OF AGENA WOULD BE
UNOFFICIAL, INFORMAL, AND FLEXIBLE. FURTHERMORE, THE COMPOSITION
ON THE WESTERN SIDE SHOULD NOT BE MADE THE OBJECT OF AN AGREEMENT
WITH THE SOVIETS. HIS AUTHORITIES COULD ACCEPT SUCH A SOLUTION
PROVIDING THAT THE WEST WOULD INDICATE TO THE SOVIETS THAT THE
SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04157 04 OF 05 181431 Z

WESTERN PARTICIPATION WOULD BE OPEN, FLEXIBLE, AND NOT CONFINED

TO DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. WESTERN PARTICIPATION WOULD BE A MATTER FOR THE AD HOC GROUP TO DECIDE ON A ROUTINE BASIS. AS FAR AS ITALY IS CONCERNED, IN ITS CAPACITY AS A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT IT WOULD USE SELF- RESTRAINT IN SEEKING TO BECOME A MEMBER OF THE SMALLER GROUP. BUT THE CONCEPT OF FLEXIBILITY RESTS ON A SPECIAL PARTICIPANT HAVING THE RIGHT TO EXPECT THAT NO DIFFICULTIES WOULD ARISE IN THE AD HOC GROUP WHEN IT ASKED TO PARTICIPATE IN A PARTICULAR DISCUSSION ON AGENDA ITEMS.

14. CHAIRMAN (CONDE OF PORTUGAL) SAID THAT GROUP NOW APPEARED TO BE IN A POSITION TO WORK OUT A SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM OF PARTICIPATION IN A SMALLER AGENDA DISCUSSION GROUP. GREEK REP (SEKERIS) SAID THAT HE COULD OFFICIALLY ACCEPT WITHOUT CONDITION THE PROPOSAL BEFORE THE GROUP TO ALLOW ALL PARTICIPANTS THE RIGHT TO TAKE PART IN AGENDA DISCUSSIONS AS THEIR INTERESTS WERE CONCERNED. NORWEGIAN REP SAID THAT HIS GOVT'S POSITION WAS IDENTICAL TO THAT OF ITALY, EXCEPT THAT IT PREFERRED CONTINUING TO USE THE PRESENT ARRANGEMENTS, I. E., THE QUARLES- DEAN CHANNEL, TO THAT OF CONDUCTING INFORMAL DISCUSSIONS AMONG ALL 19. DANISH REP SAID THAT HE RECEIVED INSTRUCTIONS CONFIRMING POSITION HE HAD TAKEN ON PERSONAL BASIS IN AD HOC GROUP ON MAY 15 (SEE VIENNA 4103, PARA 14) WHEREBY DENMARK COULD GO ALONG IF IT DID NOT SET A PRECEDENCE FOR THE FALL. FRG REP THEN ASKED FOR COMMENT BY NETHERLANDS AND US REP ON CONDITIONS POSED BY ITALIAN REP.

15. US REP SAID THAT IT DID NOT APPEAR TACTICALLY ADVISABLE TO PUT TO THE OTHER SIDE THE QUESTION OF WHETHER SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS SHOULD BE INCLUDED. RATHER, THE POINT COULD BE MADE THAT THE COMPOSITION OF THE WESTERN SIDE WOULD BE ARRIVED AT ON AN INFORMAL AND FLEXIBLE BASIS AND THIS COULD BE DONE WITHOUT RAISING THE ISSUE OF WHICH PARTICIPANTS WOULD BE REPRESENTED. HE NOTED THAT THE SPECIFIC ISSUE OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS TAKING PART IN AGENDA DISCUSSIONS IN A SMALLER GROUP RAISES PROBLEMS FOR THE EAST AND COULD FORCE THE SOVIET TO GO BACK TO RELYING ON A FORUM THAT INCLUDING ALL NINETEEN.

16. ITALIAN REP COMMENTED THAT HE WOULD LEAVE TACTICAL CONSIDERATIONS TO THE BETTER JUDGMENT OF THE US AND NETHERLANDS REPS SO LONG AS THE COMPOSITION OF THE WESTERN SIDE WAS KEPT SEPARATE AND FLEXIBLE AND NOT THE OBJECT OF AGREEMENT WITH THE
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04157 04 OF 05 181431 Z

EAST. HE REPEATED THAT HIS GOVT WOULD USE RESTRAINT IN ASKING TO PARTICIPATE, BUT WHEN IT ASKED, IT WOULD EXPECT TO PARTICIPATE WITHOUT ANY EMBARRASSING DISCUSSION. FRG REP SAID THAT IT WOULD BE UNWISE TO GET A SPECIFIC AGREEMENT WITH THE EAST SINCE THEY MIGHT RAISE THE PROBLEM OF SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS AS OBSERVERS. IT WAS IN THE WESTERN INTEREST TO NOT FORMALIZE THE ISSUE OF ADDITIONAL PARTICIPANTS. GREEK REP MADE POINT THAT FLANKS SHOULD BE ABLE TO PARTICIPATE IF NECESSARY AND ADDED THAT HIS GOVT WOULD NOT ASK TO PARTICIPATE IF OTHER FLANKS DO NOT. ITALIAN REP NOTED THAT IN HIS VIEW THE SAME FLEXIBILITY IN COMPOSITION SHOULD APPLY

WITH REGARD TO THE WESTERN POSITION ON EASTERN PARTICIPATION IN THE SMALLER GROUP.

17. US REP SAID THAT HE APPRECIATED THE HIGH LEVEL OF DISCUSSION IN THE GROUP ON THE MATTER BUT HE WONDERED IF THE SOLUTION THAT WAS EMERGING WOULD BE WORKABLE. A SMALL WORKING GROUP WAS NEEDED TO EFFECTIVELY DEAL WITH THE AGENDA QUESTIONS AND A GROUP THAT APPROACHED THE SIZE OF ALL 19 WAS NOT LIKELY TO DO THE JOB. UK REP AGREED AND, MENTIONING ONCE AGAIN THE TIME FACTOR IN THE GROUP, SAID THAT THE WEST WAS ALREADY ONLY TWO WEEKS AWAY FROM ITS OWN DEADLINE FOR COMPLETING THE TALKS. NETHERLANDS NOTED VALID REASONING OF THE FLANK COUNTRIES BY PROPOSING THAT WEST SUGGESTS A SPECIFIC NUMBER TO THE EAST IN ORDER TO KEEP THE SIZE OF THE AGENDA DISCUSSION GROUP MANAGEABLE. ITALIAN REP REPEATED THAT IT WAS THE STRONG PREFERENCE OF HIS GOVT TO CONTINUE WITH A SLIGHTLY AUGMENTED VERSION OF THE QUARLES- DEAN CHANNEL OR TO REFER TO ALL 19. BUT SINCE BOTH OF THESE HAD NOT BEEN ACCEPTABLE, HE HAD ENDEAVORED TO GET INSTRUCTIONS WHICH WOULD PERMIT THE FLANKS TO PARTICIPATE IN A SMALLER GROUP. GREEK REP SAID THAT A DECISION WAS NOT NECESSARY IN THE AD HOC GROUP NOW, SINCE THE GROUP ITSELF WOULD BE THE PLACE WHERE DECISIONS ABOUT THE COMPOSITION OF THE WESTERN SIDE WOULD BE MADE. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT IF ONE SPECIAL PARTICIPANT INSISTS ON PARTICIPATING OTHER SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS WILL DO THE SAME, AND THE AGENDA WILL BE DISCUSSED BY A GROUP OF 13 OR 14 REPRESENTATIVES, INCLUDING ROMANIA. SUCH A LARGE NUMBER POINTS TOWARDS THE SOVIET PROPOSAL TO DEAL WITH THE AGENDA QUESTION IN PLENARIES. FRG REP POINTED OUT THAT THE NUMBER IN THE GROUP COULD REMAIN THE SAME AND PERHAPS THE ITALIAN INTEREST IN FLEXIBILITY COULD BE MET BY KEEPING THE QUARLES- DEAN CHANNEL AS A NUCLEUS AROUND WHICH OTHERS COULD CIRCULATE.

SECRET

PAGE 04 VIENNA 04157 04 OF 05 181431 Z

SECRET

NMAFVVZCZADP000

PAGE 01 VIENNA 04157 05 OF 05 181449 Z

41

ACTION MBFR-03

INFO OCT-01 EUR-25 IO-12 ADP-00 CIAE-00 PM-09 H-02 INR-10

L-03 NSAE-00 NSC-10 PA-03 RSC-01 PRS-01 SS-15 USIA-12

NEA-10 GAC-01 TRSE-00 SAI-01 OIC-04 AEC-11 AECE-00

ACDA-19 OMB-01 RSR-01 /155 W

----- 101275

P R 181124 Z MAY 73

FM AMEMBASSY VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 8907

INFO SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

MBFR CAPITALS 468

USMISSION GENEVA

USNMR SHAPE

USLOSACLANT

USCINCEUR

USDOCOSOUTH

USDEL SALT TWO II

S E C R E T SECTION 5 OF 5 VIENNA 4157

GENEVA FOR DISTO

FROM US REP MBFR

18. TURKISH REP NOTED THAT BOTH OF THE PRESENT EMISSARIES WERE DIRECT PARTICIPANTS. IF FOUR WERE CHOSEN FROM THE EASTERN SIDE, THIS SHOULD BE CHALLENGED BY THE WEST BECAUSE THAT WOULD ALLOW ONLY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TO PARTICIPATE. THE BEST SOLUTION, IN HIS VIEW, WOULD BE TO ALLOW SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS TO TAKE PART BY HAVING FIVE ON EACH SIDE. WHEN ASKED BY US REP WHETHER TURKEY FELT OBLIGED TO BE INCLUDED IF WESTERN SIDE WAS MORE THAN FIVE, TURKISH REP REPLIED THAT IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HAVE NOT ONLY DIRECT PARTICIPANTS TAKE PART. IF A DISTINCTION WERE DRAWN BETWEEN DIRECT AND SPECIAL PARTICIPANTS IN THE CONTEXT OF AGENDA DISCUSSIONS, TURKISH REP SAID, HE HAD INSTRUCTIONS TO MAKE A PLENARY STATEMENT AGAINST IT.

SECRET

PAGE 02 VIENNA 04157 05 OF 05 181449 Z

19. US REP SUGGESTED THAT HE AND NETHERLANDS REP DISCUSS THE MATTER INFORMALLY WITH KHLESTOV AND SET UP A MEETING FOR MAY 21. THEY WOULD NOT DEFINITIVE SPECIFY THE CHARACTER OF THE MEETING, WHICH COULD BE DISCUSSED FURTHER IN THE GROUP ON MAY 18. THERE WERE, HOWEVER, TWO PRACTICAL MATTERS WHICH HAD TO BE CONSIDERED BY THE GROUP BEFORE THE PLENARY THAT AFTERNOON. REGARDING THE COMMUNIQUE ISSUED AFTER THE MAY 17 PLENARY, HE SUGGESTED THAT THE GROUP APPROVE A VERSION LEAVING OPEN THE DATE FOR THE NEXT PLENARY MEETING. ALSO, HE SUGGESTED THAT THE GROUP AUTHORIZE THEIR SPOKESMAN TO REJECT THE SOVIET SUGGESTION THAT DISCUSSIONS TAKE PLACE IN THE IAEA BUILDING. SOME OTHER FACILITY OF A MORE INFORMAL NATURE SHOULD BE SOUGHT.

20. NETHERLANDS REP SAID THAT HE TOO WOULD PRACTICE SELF RESTRAINT IN SEEKING TO BECOME A MEMBER OF THE GROUP AND SUGGESTED THAT SOME SYSTEM OF ROTATION MIGHT BE CONSIDERED, PROVIDING OTHERS ACCEPTED THE IDEA AND WERE WILLING TO DO THE SAME. UK REP THEN RAISED AGAIN HIS APPREHENSION ABOUT TIME SLIPPAGE AND SOUGHT TO HAVE THE EMISSARIES MAKE CLEAR TO SOVIETS THAT WEST WAS CONCERNED ABOUT PACE OF THE TALKS. HE ALSO WANTED REMAINING ITEMS TO BE DEALT WITH AS A PACKAGE AND TO LINK CSCE AND MBFR. UK REP SAID HE WOULD WANT TO MAKE A BRIEF PLENARY STATEMENT TO THAT EFFECT. US REP OBJECTED AND AFTER BRIEF DISCUSSION PERSUADED UK REP TO

BACK AWAY FROM MAKING A PLENARY STATEMENT IN RETURN FOR WESTERN
EMISSARIES TELLING SOVIETS THAT, IN WESTERN VIEW, AGENDA, DATE
AND PLACE SHOULD BE DECIDED UPON BY THE END OF MAY.

21. COMMON NATO FACILITY: IN REPLY TO A QUESTIONNAIRE CIR-
CULATED EARLIER BY MR. E. G. LUFF, NATO SECRETARIAT, MEMBERS OF
THE GROUP REPORTED PRELIMINARY VIEWS WITHOUT COMMITMENT ON
MATTERS RELATING TO ASSESSING THE ADVANTAGES AND DISADVANTAGES
OF ESTABLISHMENT OF A COMMON NATO FACILITY AT THE SITE OF
THE NEGOTIATIONS. ALL NATO REPS EXCEPT US STATED THEY STRONGLY
FAVORED COMMON FACILITY IF FEASIBLE ON GROUNDS OF SECURITY,
ALLIANCE COHESION, AND PRACTICAL WORK CONVENIENCE. EACH DELEGATION
IS SPENDING ONE HOUR A DAY AND SOMETIMES TWO HOURS IN TRANSPORT-
ATION TO AD HOC MEETING SITE. IT IS ALREADY CLEAR THAT
MEETINGS AMONG ALLIES WOULD BE MAIN ACTIVITY DURING NEGOTIATIONS
IN TERMS OF TIME SPENT. COMMON FACILITY WOULD BE ENORMOUS TIME
SAVER, IMPROVE QUALITY OF ALLIED COORDINATION AND COHESION. US
REP SAID HE SHARED THESE VIEWS ON A PERSONAL BASIS BUT THAT
SECRET

PAGE 03 VIENNA 04157 05 OF 05 181449 Z

WASHINGTON HAD NOT TAKEN POSITION ON DESIRABILITY OF COMMON
FACILITIES AND HE COULD PARTICIPATE IN CURRENT EXERCISE ONLY
IN SENSE THAT IT REPRESENTED EFFORT TO PULL TOGETHER POSSIBLE
FIGURES FOR ESTIMATE AND WITHOUT COMMITMENT. REPS ESTIMATED
POSSIBLE REQUIREMENTS FOR OFFICE UNITS AND AGREED THAT IF THERE
WAS TO BE COMMON FACILITY, FINANCIAL PARTICIPATION MIGHT
LOCALLICALY BE BASED ON THE AREA OCCUPED BY A DELEGATION AND
A PRO RATA SHARE OF COMMON AREAS.

22. NEXT MEETING AD HOC GROUP WAS SET FOR 10:30 AM MAY 18 AT
US EMBASSY. HUMES

SECRET
NMAFVVZCZ
<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 18 MAY 1973
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: morefirh
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973VIENNA04157
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: N/A
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: VIENNA
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730560/abqcelmd.tel
Line Count: 575
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: ACTION MBF
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 11
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: morefirh
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags: ANOMALY
Review Date: 29 AUG 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <29-Aug-2001 by freemaal>; APPROVED <02-Nov-2001 by morefirh>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: <DBA CORRECTED> mcm 980220
Subject: MBFR: AD HOC GROUP MEETING MAY 17
TAGS: PARM
To: STATE INFO SECDEF
MBFR CAPITALS
GENEVA
USNMR SHAPE
USLOSACLANT
USCINCEUR
USDOCOSOUTH

SALT TWO II

Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005